A U M

All noble things are as difficult as they are rare.—SPINOZA

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIV August, 1956 No. 10

THE BRIDGE OF DOCTRINE

WHILE the decline of human faith in the religious doctrines of Christianity began centuries ago, it was far from complete in the year 1875 when H. P. Blavatsky launched the Theosophical Movement. Since her time, the decline has been more rapid. Today, although there are still many many million Christians, and although their number grows apace, according to report, in these days of spreading anxiety, actual *faith in doctrine* has not strengthened, but if anything gone the other way. Adherence to denominational Christianity is probably a psychic "herd" phenomenon rather than evidence of religious thinking. The average Christian knows little or nothing of doctrine, regarding a few simple, ethical precepts and a "belief in God," however vague, as sufficient to qualify him for the name of Christian.

The present is rather a time when doctrines have lost their force——a force they once possessed through always assured answers to philosophical questions. The force is gone because, in the first place, the answers supplied by dogmatic creeds are never quite good enough answers, and, in the second place, the entire doctrinal account of human existence provided by Christianity has been discredited by scientific discovery.

The victory of science over religious doctrines, however, was not a victory of competing faiths, but rather a devastating rout of the very idea of doctrinal truth. This triumph of agnosticism reached a climax in the widespread adoption, in recent years, of the Positivist philosophy of negation by the representative minds of the epoch. It is the Posi-

tivist view that all doctrines about the nature of things traffic in unknowables—either unknowables or impossibles—and that they deserve notice only as a curiosity of the now past "metaphysical" or "religious" age of mankind.

Theosophists of H.P.B.'s time would probably have been pained, could they have looked into the future and seen this development in what we habitually if loosely call the "race mind." For if faith in doctrines of any sort dies away, what can be hoped for the acceptance of Theosophical tenets?

The important question for reflection, here, is whether a substitution of Theosophical for Christian "doctrines" is to the advantage of the Theosophical Movement. In terms of logic, the Theosophical doctrines are unquestionably superior. Yet what shall we say when, after the passage of some seventy-five years, and the relative mastery of Theosophical doctrines by many students, we turn to the world to offer them and find that doctrines of any sort are unwelcome?

This is not altogether the case in the present, yet it is enough the case to make a situation that needs study. The situation is well illustrated by the fact that many young people who are now shaking loose the *skandhas* of Christian culture are turning to the relatively doctrineless teachings of Theravada Buddhism and Zen Buddhism. There is shallowness, perhaps, and artificiality in their expectation of finding deep truth in this way, but the situation nevertheless exists and should be considered. This is only one phase of the general rejection of doctrine, which is reflected at many levels in modern culture. It is found among the Positivists, who have already been mentioned; among the Existentialists, who find a bleak virtue in intellectual nihilism and desperation; and, more widely, in the general apathy toward "teachings" of any sort, unless they be somehow connected with a glamor which adds little credit to those who find themselves attracted by its appeal.

So, while we are waiting, wondering, and doing what we can, there should be merit in an investigation of doctrine.

Doctrine, in Theosophy, represents particular applications of principles which the student could hardly make for himself, unaided. No doubt an infinitely wise man would be able to deduce from the Three Fundamental propositions of the Secret Doctrine certain recondite teachings concerning the condition of the ego in the after-death states; and no doubt each one of us—each student—will have to make

these deductions for himself, and prove them through first-hand experience, before he can exchange Theosophical theory—theory, so far as he is concerned, and doctrine, in the terms of the literature—for individual knowledge and certainty.

But what would he be, on the other hand, *without* the doctrines—with only, for example, a knowledge of the Fundamental Propositions? He would probably be little more than a second-hand Herbert Spencer, or something like that, for Spencer, at least, was able to formulate something very like the Fundamentals for himself, and this was no mean achievement. We do not "know better" than Herbert Spencer because of an equivalent or greater ability to wrest the secrets of the universe from Nature by a process of intense reflection; we know better by reason of a fortunate alliance with those who have, we believe, *taught us better*—a privilege Mr. Spencer did not enjoy.

The doctrines of Theosophy represent our good fortune, or our Karma, but they do not, alas, of themselves make us either wise or great. We may in fact remain less wise and certainly less great than Mr. Spencer. This makes a certain awkwardness of thought for us when reflecting or speaking about Mr. Spencer's philosophy in a critical vein. Could we stand up so boldly to Mr. Spencer himself, were he among us? Or what *would* be the proper attitude?

Yet there is surely more to the role of doctrine than to bring embarrassment to students who have embraced and profited by it. And the testimony of intuition can hardly be disregarded when it adds a mighty support to the logical appeal of Theosophical doctrines. What, actually, do we know at first hand, and what remains only doctrine to us? The most obvious thing about this question is that it cannot be answered with any real precision. What we *know* is changing all the time. We may both know and not know a thing within the space of a single hour, as a result of a storm of feeling which sweeps first in one direction, then in another.

Perhaps we should say that knowledge, real knowledge, cannot thus be swept away, and this is doubtless true, but there, in the plastic part of our nature, the growth may be taking place. When Arjuna saw through the eye of Krishna, for the moment, he *knew;* then, later, he knew not, and yet the impression of divine vision remained with him as a testament of knowing. There is, then, a twilight zone for every one, where light now advances, now retreats; where doctrines are now confirmed, and now misunderstood or set aside. Some day, all these

doubts and puzzlements will pass away; but not now, and not tomorrow. Doctrines are the bars in the gymnasium of the mind on which to try our strength. When they are knowledge, we shall no longer be troubled by such questions. Meanwhile, we know from the teachings where to try our strength, and how to make what strength we already possess count for the most it can.

As for the world in its present state of disillusionment, it cannot continue long without doctrines of some sort. A time may not be far off when the hunger for explanation will make a new hospitality for doctrines. And then the field will be open to those who have learned what doctrines are for, and how they may be rightly used by people in search of the means of self-instruction.

The truth! How we cherish its possession, yet to prove that it is the truth, we have need of showing, also, how one learns to possess it, for if this cannot be taught, then, as we so often say of the dogmatists, it cannot be possessed.

INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY

One soul is a counterpoise of all souls, as a capillary column of water is a balance for the sea. It must treat things, and books, and sovereign genius, as itself also a sovereign. If Æschylus be that man he is taken for, he has not yet done his office, when he has educated the learned of Europe for a thousand years. He is now to approve himself a master of delight to me also. If he cannot do that, all his fame shall avail him nothing with me. I were a fool not to sacrifice a thousand Æschyluses to my intellectual integrity. Especially take the same ground in regard to abstract truth, the science of the mind. The Bacon, the Spinoza, the Hume, Schelling, Kant, or whosoever propounds to you a philosophy of the mind, is only a more or less awkward translator of things in your consciousness, which you have also your way of seeing, perhaps of denominating. Say, then, instead of too timidly poring into his obscure sense, that he has not succeeded in rendering back to you your consciousness. He has not succeeded; now let another try. If Plato cannot, perhaps Spinoza will. If Spinoza cannot, then perhaps Kant. Anyhow, when at last it is done, you will find it is no recondite, but a simple, natural, common state, which the writer restores to you.

—EMERSON

THE BABEL OF MODERN THOUGHT

[The following article by H. P. Blavatsky first appeared in two parts, *Lucifer* for January and February, 1891. A reprint in the same form was issued in THEOSOPHY 4:405, 444, and excerpts of central importance appeared under the same title in THEOSOPHY 29:558. The present printing combines both Part One and Part Two of "The Babel of Modern Thought" for the convenience of students, and has not been abridged. Though a certain amount of the material relates specifically to names and issues of the late nineteenth century, and is thus less "timeless" than much of H.P.B.'s writing, the vigor and contemporary sophistication of her pen are clearly revealed—a reminder, perhaps, of the extensive obligations demanded by balanced Theosophic construction.

The "moderns" have vastly improved in their own sophistication and catholicity since 1891, as a theosophical evolution of philosophy and scholarship has steadily proceeded. This gradual transition, however, need not be thought to have come about as an entirely separate development from the mighty currents of thought set in motion by H. P. Blavatsky herself. One of her major tasks, as she explicitly stated, was to disabuse her contemporaries of the notion that the ancients were of an inferior intellectual breed; the impact of *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* on this point has been, and still is, considerable.—Editors]

> O ye Lords of Truth who are cycling in eternity
> . . . save me from the annihilation in this
> Region of the *Two Truths.*
>
> —Egyptian *Ritual of the Dead*.

I

THAT the world moves in cycles, and events repeat themselves therein, is an old, yet ever new truism. It is new to most, firstly, because it belongs to a distinct group of occult aphorisms *in partibus infidelium,* and our present-day Rabbis and Pharisees will accept nothing coming from *that* Nazareth; secondly, because those who will swallow a camel of whatever size, provided it hails from orthodox or accepted authorities, will strain and kick at the smallest gnat, if only its buzz comes from theosophical regions. Yet this proposition about the world cycles and ever-recurring events, is a very correct one. It is one, moreover, that people could easily verify for themselves. Of course, the people meant here are men who do their own thinking; not those others who are satisfied to remain, from birth till death, pinned,

like a thistle fastened to the coat-tail of a country parson, to the beliefs and thoughts of the goody-goody majority.

We cannot agree with a writer (was it Gilpin?) who said that the grandest truths are often rejected, "not so much for want of direct evidence, as for want of inclination to search for it." This applies but to a few. Nine-tenths of the people will reject the most overwhelming evidence, even if it be brought to them without any trouble to themselves, only because it happens to clash with their personal interests or prejudices; especially if it comes from unpopular quarters. We are living in a highly moral atmosphere, high sounding—in words. Put to the test of practice, however, the morality of this age in point of genuineness and reality is of the nature of the black skin of the "negro" minstrel: assumed for show and pay, and washed off at the close of every performance. In sober truth, our opponents—advocates of official science, defenders of orthodox religion, and the *tutti quanti* of the detractors of Theosophy—who claim to oppose our works on grounds of *scientific* "evidence," "public good and truth," strongly resemble advocates in our courts of law—miscalled of justice. These in their defence of robbers and murderers, forgers and adulterers, deem it to be their duty to browbeat, confuse and bespatter all who bear witness against their clients, and will ignore, or if possible, suppress, all evidence which goes to incriminate them. Let ancient Wisdom step into the witness-box herself, and prove that the goods found in the possession of the prisoner at the bar, were taken from her own strong-box; and she will find herself accused of all manner of crimes, fortunate if she escape being branded as a common fraud, and told that she is no better than she should be.

What member of our Society can wonder then, that in this our age, preeminently one of shams and shows, the "theosophists'" *teachings* so (mis-) called, seem to be the most unpopular of all the systems now to the fore; or that materialism and theology, science and modern philosophy, have arrayed themselves in holy alliance against theosophical studies—perhaps because all the former are based on chips and broken-up fragments of that primordial system. Cotton complains somewhere, that the "metaphysicians have been learning their lesson for the last four (?) thousand years," and that "it is now high time that they should begin to teach something." But, no sooner is the possibility of such studies offered, with the complete evidence into the bargain that they belong to the oldest doctrine of the metaphysical

philosophy of mankind, than, instead of giving them a fair hearing at least, the majority of the complainers turn away with a sneer and the cool remark: "Oh, you must have invented all you say yourself!"

Dear ladies and gentlemen, has it ever occurred to you, how truly grand and almost *divine* would be that man or woman, who, at this time of the life of mankind, could invent anything, or discover that which had not been invented and known ages before? The charge of being such an inventor would only entitle the accused to the choicest honours. For show us, if you can, that mortal who in the historical cycle of our human race has taught the world something entirely new. To the proud pretentions of this age, Occultism—the real Eastern Occultism, or the so-called Esoteric Doctrine—answers through its ablest students: Indeed all your boasted knowledge is but the reflex action of the bygone Past. At best, you are but the modern popularisers of very ancient ideas. Consciously and unconsciously you have pilfered from old classics and philosophers, who were themselves but the superficial recorders—cautious and incomplete, owing to the terrible penalties for divulging the secrets of initiation taught during the mysteries—of the primæval Wisdom. Avaunt! your modern sciences and speculations are but the *réchauffé* dishes of antiquity; the dead bones (served with a *sauce piquante* of crass materialism, to disguise them) of the intellectual repasts of the gods. Ragon was right in saying in his *Maçonnerie Occulte,* that "humanity only *seems* to progress in achieving one discovery after the other, as in truth, it only finds that which it had lost. Most of our modern inventions for which we claim such glory, are, after all, things people were acquainted with three and four thousand years back.[1] Lost to us through wars, floods and fire, their very existence became obliterated from the memory of man. And now modern thinkers begin to *rediscover* them once more."

Allow us to recapitulate a few of such things and thus refresh your memory.

Deny, if you can, that the most important of our present sciences were known to the ancients. It is not Eastern literature only, and the whole cycle of those esoteric teachings which an over-zealous Christian Kabalist, in France, has just dubbed "the *accursed* sciences"—that will give you a flat denial, but profane classical literature, as well. The proof is easy.

---

[1] The learned Belgian Mason would be nearer the mark by adding a few more ciphers to his four thousand years.

Are not physics and natural sciences but an amplified reproduction of the works of Anaxagoras, of Empedocles, Democritus and others? All that is taught *now,* was taught by these philosophers *then.* For they maintained—even in the fragments of their works still extant—that the Universe is composed of eternal atoms which, moved by a subtle internal Fire, combine in millions of various ways. With them, this "Fire" was the divine Breath of the Universal Mind, but now, it has become with the modern philosophers no better than a blind and senseless Force. Furthermore they taught that there was neither Life nor Death, but only a constant *destruction of form,* produced by perpetual *physical* transformations. This has now become by *intellectual* transformation, that which is known as the physical correlation of forces, conservation of energy, law of continuity and what not, in the vocabulary of modern Science. But "what's in a name," or in new-fangled words and compound terms, once that the identity of the essential ideas is established?

Was not Descartes indebted for his *original* theories to the old Masters, to Leucippus and Democritus, Lucretius, Anaxagoras and Epicurus? These taught that the celestial bodies were formed of a multitude of atoms, whose vortical motion existed from eternity; which met, and, rotating together, the heaviest were drawn to the centres, the lightest to the circumferences; each of these concretions was carried away in a fluidic matter, which, receiving from this rotation an impulse, the stronger communicated it to the weaker concretions. This seems a tolerably close description of the Cartesian theory of Elemental Vortices taken from Anaxagoras and some others; and it does look most suspiciously like the "vortical atoms" of Sir W. Thompson!

Even Sir Isaac Newton, the greatest among the great, is found constantly mirroring a dozen or so of our philosophers. In reading his works one sees floating in the air the pale images of the same Anaxagoras and Democritus, or Pythagoras, Aristotle, Timæus of Locris, Lucretius, Macrobius, and even our old friend Plutarch. All these have maintained one or the other of these propositions: (1) that the smallest of the particles of matter would be sufficient—owing to its infinite divisibility—to fill infinite space; (2) that there exist two Forces emanated from the Universal Soul, combined in numerical proportions (the centripetal and centrifugal "forces," of the latter day scientific saints); (3) that there was a mutual attraction of bodies, which *attraction* causes the latter to, what we now call, *gravitate* and keeps them within

their respective spheres; (4) they hinted most unmistakably at the relation existing between the weight and the density, or the quantity of matter contained in a unit of mass; and (5) taught that the attraction (gravitation) of the planets toward the Sun is in reciprocal proportion to their distance from that luminary.

Finally, is it not a historical fact that the rotation of the Earth and the heliocentric system were taught by Pythagoras—not to speak of Hicetas, Heraclides, Ecphantus, &c.,—over 2,000 years before the despairing and now famous cry of Galileo, *"E pur, se muove"?* Did not the priests of Etruria and the Indian *Rishis* still earlier, know how to attract lightning, ages upon ages before even the *astral* Sir B. Franklin was formed in space? Euclid is honoured to this day—perhaps, because one cannot juggle as easily with mathematics and figures, as with symbols and words bearing on unprovable hypotheses. Archimedes had probably forgotten more in his day, than our modern mathematicians, astronomers, geometricians, mechanicians, hydrostaticians and opticians ever knew. Without Archytas, the disciple of Pythagoras, the application of the theory of mathematics to practical purposes would, perchance, remain still unknown to our grand era of inventions and machinery. Needless to remind the reader of that which the Aryans knew, as it is already recorded in the *Theosophist* and other works obtainable in India.

Wise was Solomon in saying that "there is *no new* thing under the Sun"; and that everything that *is* "hath been already of old time, which was before us"—save, perhaps, the theosophical doctrines which the humble writer of the present is charged by some with having "invented." The prime origin of this (very complimentary) accusation is due to the kind efforts of the S.P.R. It is the more considerate and kind of this "world famous, and learned Society" of "Researches," as its scribes seem utterly incapable of inventing anything original themselves—even in the way of manufacturing a common place illustration.

* * * * *

In short, it may be said of the scientific theories, that those which are true are not new; and those which are new—are not true, or are at least, very dubious. It is easy to hide behind "merely *working* hypotheses," but less easy to maintain their plausibility in the face of logic and philosophy. To make short work of a very big subject, we have but to institute a brief comparison between the old and the new

teachings. That which modern science would make us believe, is this: the atoms possess *innate* and immutable properties. That which Esoteric, and also exoteric, Eastern philosophy calls *divine* Spirit Substance (*Purusha Prakriti*) or eternal Spirit-matter, one inseparable from the other, modern Science calls Force and Matter, adding as we do (for it is a Vedantic conception), that, the two being inseparable, matter is but an abstraction (an illusion rather). The properties of matter are, by the Eastern Occultists, summed up in, or brought down to, attraction and repulsion; by the Scientists, to gravitation and affinities. According to this teaching, the properties of complex combinations are but the necessary results of the composition of elementary properties; the most complex existences being the physico-chemical automata, called men. Matter from being primarily scattered and inanimate, begets life, sensation, emotions and will, after a whole series of consecutive "gropings." The latter non-felicitous expression (belonging to Mr. Tyndall), forced the philosophical writer, Delboeuf[2] to criticize the English Scientist in very disrespectful terms, and forces us in our turn, to agree with the former. Matter, or anything equally conditioned, once that it is declared to be subject to immutable laws, *cannot* "grope." But this is a trifle when compared with dead or *inanimate* matter, producing *life,* and even psychic phenomena of the highest mentality! Finally, a rigid determination reigns over all nature. All that which has once happened to our *automatical* Universe, had to happen, as the future of that Universe is traced in the smallest of its particles or "atoms." Return these atoms, they say, to the same position and order they were in at the first moment of the evolution of the physical Kosmos, and the same universal phenomena will be repeated in precisely the same order, and the Universe will once more return to its present conditions. To this, logic and philosophy answer that it cannot be so, as the properties of the particles vary and are changeable. If the atoms are eternal and matter indestructible, these atoms can never have been born; hence they can have nothing *innate* in them. Theirs is the one homogeneous (and we add *divine*) substance, while compound molecules receive their properties, at the beginning of the life cycles or *manvantaras,* from *within without.* Organisms cannot have been developed from dead or inanimate matter, as, firstly, such matter does not exist, and secondly, philosophy proving it conclusively, the Universe is not "sub-

[2] In the *Revue Philosophique* of 1883, where he translates such "gropings" by *atonnements successifs.*

jected to fatality." As Occult Science teaches that the universal process of differentiation begins anew after every period of *Mahapralaya,* there is no reason to think that it would slavishly and blindly repeat itself. *Immutable* laws last only from the incipient to the last stage of the universal life, being simply the effects of primordial, intelligent and entirely free action. For Theosophists, as also for Dr. Pirogoff, Delboeuf and many a great independent modern thinker, it is the Universal (and to us *impersonal* because *infinite*) Mind, which is the true and primordial Demiurg.

What better illustrates the theory of cycles, than the following fact? Nearly 700 years B.C., in the schools of Thales and Pythagoras, was taught the doctrine of the true motion of the earth, its form and the whole heliocentric system. And in 317 A.D. Lactantius, the preceptor of Crispus Cæsar, the son of the Emperor Constantine, is found teaching his pupil that the earth was a plane surrounded by the sky, itself composed of fire and water! Moreover, the venerable Church Father warned his pupil against the *heretical doctrine of the earth's globular form,* as the Cambridge and Oxford "Father Dons" warn their students now, against the pernicious and superstitious doctrines of Theosophy —such as Universal Mind, Reincarnation and so on. There is a resolution tacitly accepted by the members of the T.S. for the adoption of a proverb of King Solomon, paraphrased for our daily use; "A scientist is wiser in his own conceit than seven Theosophists that can render a reason." No time, therefore, should be lost in arguing with them; but no endeavour, on the other hand, should be neglected to show up their mistakes and blunders. The scientific conceit of the Orientalists—especially of the youngest branch of these—the Assyriologists and the Egyptologists—is indeed phenomenal. Hitherto, some credit was given to the ancients—to their philosophers and *Initiates,* at any rate—of knowing a few things that the moderns could not rediscover. But now even the greatest Initiates are represented to the public as fools. Here is an instance. On pages 15, 16 and 17 (*Introduction*) in the Hibbert Lectures of 1887 by Prof. Sayce, on *The Ancient Babylonians,* the reader is brought face to face with a conundrum that may well stagger the unsophisticated admirer of modern learning. Complaining of the difficulties and obstacles that meet the Assyriologist at every step of his studies; after giving "the dreary catalogue" of the formidable struggles of the interpreter to make sense of the inscriptions from broken fragments of clay tiles; the Professor goes on to confess that the scholar

who has to read these cuneiform characters, is often likely "to put a false construction upon isolated passages, the context of which must be supplied from conjecture" (p. 14). Notwithstanding all this, the learned lecturer *places the modern Assyriologist higher than the ancient Babylonian Initiate,* in the knowledge of symbols and his own religion!

The passage deserves to be quoted *in toto*:

> "It is true that many of the sacred texts were so written as to be intelligible only to the initiated; but the initiated were provided with keys and glosses, *many of which are in our hands* (?) .... We can penetrate into the real meaning of documents which to him (the ordinary Babylonian) were a sealed book. Nay, more than this, the researches that have been made during the last half-century into the creed and beliefs of the nations of the world both past and present, *have given us a clue* to the interpretation of these documents *which even the initiated priests did not possess.*"

The above (the italics being our own) may be better appreciated when thrown into a syllogistic form.

Major premise: The ancient Initiates had keys and glosses to their esoteric texts, *of which they were the* INVENTORS.

Minor premise: Our Orientalists have *many* of these keys.

Conclusion: *Ergo,* the Orientalists have a clue which the *Initiates themselves did not possess!!*

Into what were the Initiates, in such a case, initiated?—and who invented the blinds, we ask.

Few Orientalists could answer this query. We are more generous, however; and may show in our next that, into which our modest Orientalists have never yet been initiated—all their alleged "clues" to the contrary.

> Go to, let us go down and there confound their language
> that they may not understand one another's speech....
> —*Genesis* xi

II

Having done with modern physical Sciences we next turn to Western philosophies and religions. Every one of these is equally based upon, and derives its theories and doctrines from heathen, and moreover, *exoteric* thought. This can easily be traced from Schopenhauer and Mr. Herbert Spencer, down to Hypnotism and so-called "Mental Science." The German philosophers modernize Buddhism; the English are inspired by Vedantism; while the French, borrowing from both, add to

them Plato, in a Phrygian cap, and occasionally, as with Auguste Comte, the weird sex-worship of Mariolatry of the old Roman Catholic ecstatics and visionaries. New systems, yclept philosophical, new sects and societies, spring up now-a-days in every corner of our civilized lands. But even the highest among them agree on no one point, though each claims supremacy. This, because no science, no philosophy—being at best, but a fragment broken from the WISDOM RELIGION—can stand alone, or be complete in itself. Truth, to be complete, must represent an unbroken continuity. It must have no gaps, no missing links. And which of our modern religions, sciences or philosophies, is free from such defects? Truth is One. Even as the palest reflection of the Absolute, it can be no more dual than is absoluteness itself, nor can it have *two* aspects. But such truth is not for the majorities, in our world of illusion—especially for those minds which are devoid of the noëtic element. These have to substitute for the high spiritual and *quasi* absolute truth the relative one, which having two sides or aspects, both conditioned by appearances, lead our "brain-minds"—one to intellectual scientific materialism, the other to materialistic or anthropomorphic religiosity. But even that kind of truth, in order to offer a coherent and complete system of something, has, while naturally clashing with its opposite, to offer no gaps and contradictions, no broken or missing links, in the special system or doctrine it undertakes to represent.

And here a slight digression must come in. We are sure to be told by some, that this is precisely the objection taken to theosophical expositions, from *Isis Unveiled* down to the *Secret Doctrine.* Agreed. We are quite prepared to confess that the latter work, especially, surpasses in these defects all the other theosophical works. We are quite ready to admit the faults charged against it by its critics—that it is badly arranged, discursive, over-burdened with digressions into by-ways of mythology, etc., etc. But then it is neither *a* philosophical system nor *the* Doctrine, called secret or esoteric, but only a record of a few of its facts and a *witness* to it. It has never claimed to be the *full* exposition of the system (it advocates) in its totality; (*a*) because as the writer does not boast of being a great Initiate, she could, therefore, never have undertaken such a gigantic task; and (*b*) because had she been one, she would have divulged still less. It has never been contemplated to make of the sacred truths an integral system for the ribaldry and sneers of a profane and iconoclastic public. The work does not pretend to set

up a series of explanations, complete in all their details, of the mysteries of Being; nor does it seek to win for itself the name of a distinct system of thought—like the works of Messrs. Herbert Spencer, Schopenhauer or Comte. On the contrary the *Secret Doctrine* merely asserts that a system, known as the WISDOM RELIGION, the work of generations of adepts and seers, the sacred heirloom of pre-historic times—actually exists, though hitherto preserved in the greatest secrecy by the present Initiates; and it points to various corroborations of its existence to this very day, to be found in ancient and modern works. Giving a few fragments only, it there shows how these explain the religious dogmas of the present day, and how they might serve Western religions, philosophies and science, as sign-posts along the untrodden paths of discovery. The work is essentially fragmentary, giving statements of sundry facts taught in the esoteric schools—kept, so far, secret—by which the ancient symbolism of various nations is interpreted. It does not even give the *keys* to it, but merely opens a few of the hitherto secret drawers. No *new* philosophy is set up in the *Secret Doctrine,* only the hidden meaning of some of the religious allegories of antiquity is given, light being thrown on these by the esoteric sciences, and the common source is pointed out, whence all the world-religions and philosophies have sprung. Its chief attempt is to show, that however divergent the respective doctrines and systems of old may *seem* on their external or objective side, the agreement between all becomes perfect, so soon as the esoteric or *inner* side of these beliefs and their symbology are examined and a careful comparison made. It is also maintained that its doctrines and sciences, which form an integral cycle of universal cosmic facts and metaphysical axioms and truths, represent a complete and unbroken system; and that he who is brave and persevering enough, ready to crush the *animal* in himself, and forgetting the human *self,* sacrifices it to his Higher Ego, can always find his way to become initiated into these mysteries. This is all the *Secret Doctrine* claims. Are not a few facts and self-evident truths, found in these volumes—all the literary defects of the exposition notwithstanding,—truths *already proved practically to some,* better than the most ingenious "working" hypotheses, liable to be upset any day, than the *unexplainable* mysteries of religious dogmas, or the most seemingly profound philosophical speculations? Can the grandest among these speculations be really profound, when from their *Alpha* to their *Omega* they are limited and conditioned by their author's *brain*-mind, hence dwarfed and crippled

on that Procrustean bed, cut down to fit limited sensuous perceptions which will not allow the intellect to go beyond their enchanted circle? No "philosopher" who views the spiritual realm as a mere figment of superstition, and regards man's mental perceptions as simply the result of the organization of the brain, can ever be worthy of that name.

Nor has a materialist any right to the appellation, since it means a "lover of Wisdom," and Pythagoras, who was the first to coin the compound term, never limited Wisdom to this earth. One who affirms that the Universe and Man are objects of the senses only, and who fatally chains thought within the region of senseless matter, as do the Darwinian evolutionists, is at best a *sophiaphobe* when not a philosophaster— never a philosopher.

Therefore is it that in this age of Materialism, Agnosticism, Evolutionism, and false Idealism, there is not a system, however intellectually expounded, that can stand on its own legs, or fail to be criticized by an exponent from another school of thought as materialistic as itself; even Mr. Herbert Spencer, the greatest of all, is unable to answer some criticisms. Many are those who remember the fierce polemics that raged a few years ago in the English and American journals between the Evolutionists on the one hand and the Positivists on the other. The subject of the dispute was with regard to the attitude and relation that the theory of evolution would bear to religion. Mr. F. Harrison, the Apostle of Positivism, charged Mr. Herbert Spencer with restricting religion to the realm of reason, forgetting that feeling and not the cognizing faculty, played the most important part in it. The "erroneousness and insufficiency" of the ideas on the "Unknowable"— as developed in Mr. Spencer's works—were also taken to task by Mr. Harrison. The idea was *erroneous,* he held, because it was based on the acceptation of the metaphysical absolute. It was insufficient, he argued, because it brought deity down to an empty abstraction, void of any meaning.[3] To this the great English writer replied, that he had never thought of offering his "Unknowable" and Incognizable, as a subject for religious worship. Then stepped into the arena, the respective admirers and defenders of Messrs. Spencer and Harrison, some defending the *material metaphysics* of the former thinker (if we may be permitted to use this paradoxical yet correct definition of Mr. Herbert Spencer's philosophy), others, the arguments of the Godless and Christless Ro-

[3] As the above is repeated from memory, it does not claim to be quoted with verbal exactitude, but only to give the gist of the argument.

man Catholicism of Auguste Comte,[4] both sides giving and receiving very hard blows. Thus, Count d'Alviella of Brussels[5] suddenly discovered in Mr. H. Spencer a kind of hidden, yet *reverential* Theist, and compared Mr. Harrison to a casuist of mediæval Scholasticism.

It is not to discuss the relative merits of materialistic Evolutionism, or of Positivism either, that the two English thinkers are brought forward; but simply to point, as an illustration, to the Babel-like confusion of modern thought. While the Evolutionists (of Herbert Spencer's school) maintain that the historical evolution of the religious feeling consists in the constant abstraction of the attributes of Deity, and their final separation from the primitive concrete conceptions—this process rejoicing in the easy-going triple compound of *deanthropomorphization,* or the disappearance of human attributes—the Comtists on their side hold to another version. They affirm that fetishism, or the direct worship of nature, was the primitive religion of man, a too-protracted evolution alone having landed it in anthropomorphism. Their Deity is Humanity and the God they worship, Mankind, as far as we understand them. The only way, therefore, of settling the dispute, is to ascertain which of the two "philosophical" and "scientific" theories, is the less pernicious and the more probable. Is it true to say, as d'Alviella assures us, that Mr. Spencer's "Unknowable" contains all the elements necessary to religion; and, as that remarkable writer is alleged to imply, that "religious feeling tends to free itself from every moral element"; or, shall we accept the other extremity and agree with the Comtists, that gradually religion will blend itself with, merge into, and disappear in *altruism* and its service to Humanity? Useless to say that Theosophy, while rejecting the one-sidedness and therefore the *limitation* in both ideas, is alone able to reconcile the two, *i.e.,* the Evolutionists and the Positivists—on both metaphysical and practical lines. How to do this it is not here the place to say, as every Theosophist acquainted with the main tenets of the Esoteric Philosophy can do it for himself. We believe in an impersonal "Unknowable" and know well that the ABSOLUTE, or Absoluteness, can have nought to do with worship on anthropomorphic lines; Theosophy rejects the Spencerian "He" and substi-

[4] The epithet is Mr. Huxley's. In his lecture in Edinburgh in 1868, *On the Physical Basis of Life,* this great opponent remarked that Auguste "Comte's philosophy in practice might be compendiously described as *Catholicism minus Christianity,* and antagonistic to the very essence of Science."

[5] Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the University of Brussels, in a philosophical *Essay on the religious meaning of the "Unknowable."*

tutes the impersonal IT for the personal pronoun, whenever speaking of the Absolute and the "Unknowable." And it teaches, as foremost of all virtues, *altruism* and self-sacrifice, brotherhood and compassion for every living creature, without, for all that, worshipping Man or Humanity. In the Positivist, moreover, who admits of no immortal soul in men, believes in no future life or reincarnation, such a "worship" becomes worse than fetishism: it is *Zoolatry,* the worship of the animals. For that alone which constitutes the *real* Man is, in the words of Carlyle, "the essence of our being, the mystery in us that calls itself 'I'— . . . a breath of Heaven; the Highest Being reveals himself in man." This denied, man is but an animal—"the shame and scandal of the Universe," as Pascal puts it.

It is the old, old story, the struggle of matter and spirit, the "survival of the *unfittest,*" because of the strongest and most material. But the period when nascent Humanity, following the law of the natural and *dual* evolution, was descending along with spirit into matter—is closed. We (Humanity) are now helping matter to ascend toward spirit; and to do that we have to help substance to disenthral itself from the viscous grip of sense. We, of the fifth Root Race, are the direct descendants of the primeval Humanity of that Race; those, who on this side of the Flood tried, by commemorating it, to save the antediluvian Truth and Wisdom, and were worsted in our efforts by the dark genius of the Earth—the spirit of matter, whom the Gnostics called Ildabaoth and the Jews Jehovah. Think ye, that even the Bible of Moses, the book you know so well and understand so badly, has left this claim of the Ancient Doctrine without witness? It has not. Allow us to close with a (to you) familiar passage, only interpreted in its true light.

In the beginning of time, or rather, in the childhood of the fifth Race, "the whole earth was of one *lip* and of one speech," saith chapter XI of *Genesis.* Read esoterically, this means that mankind had one universal doctrine, a philosophy, common to all; and that men were *bound* by one religion, whether this term be derived from the Latin word *relegere,* "to gather, or be united" in speech or in thought, from *religens,* "revering the gods," or from *religare,* "to be bound fast together." Take it one way or the other, it means most undeniably and plainly that our forefathers from beyond the "flood" accepted in common one *truth—i.e.,* they believed in that aggregate of subjective and objective *facts* which form the consistent, logical and harmonious whole called by us the *Wisdom Religion.*

Now, reading the first nine verses of chapter XI between the lines, we get the following information. Wise in their generation, our early fathers were evidently acquainted with the imperishable truism which teaches that *in union alone lies strength*—in union of thought as well as in that of nations, of course. Therefore, lest in disunion they should be "scattered upon the face of the earth," and their Wisdom-religion should, in consequence, be broken up into a thousand fragments; and lest they, themselves, instead of towering as hitherto, *through knowledge,* heavenward, should, through *blind faith* begin gravitating earthward—the wise men, who "journeyed from the East," devised a plan. In those days temples were sites of learning, not of superstition; priests taught divine Wisdom, not man-invented dogmas, and the *ultima thule* of their religious activity did not centre in the contribution box, as at present. Thus—" 'Go to,' they said. 'let us *build a city* and a *tower,* whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make a name.' And they made *burnt brick* and used it for *stone,* and built therewith a *city* and a *tower.*"

So far, this is a very old story, known as well to a Sunday school ragamuffin as to Mr. Gladstone. Both believe very sincerely that these descendants of the "accursed Ham" were proud sinners whose object was like that of the Titans, to insult and dethrone Zeus-Jehovah, by reaching "heaven," the supposed abode of both. But since we find the story told in the *revealed*[6] Scripts, it must, like all the rest in them, have its esoteric interpretation. In this, Occult symbolism will help us. All the expressions that we have italicized, when read in the original Hebrew and according to the canons of esoteric symbolism, will yield quite a different construction. Thus:

1. "And the whole earth (mankind), was of *one lip* (*i.e.,* proclaimed the same teachings) and of the same *words*"—not of "speech" as in the authorized version.

---

[6] A curious and rather unfortunate word to use, since, as a translation from the Latin *revelare,* it signifies diametrically the opposite of the now accepted meaning in English. For the word "to reveal" or "revealed" is derived from the Latin *revelare,* "to reveil" and not to *reveal, i.e.,* from *re* "again" or "back" and *velare* "to veil," or to hide something, from the word *velum* or "a vail" (or veil), a cover. Thus, instead of *un*vailing, or *revealing,* Moses has truly only "reveiled" once more the Egypto-Chaldean theological legends and allegories, into which, as one "learned in all the Wisdom of Egypt" he had been initiated. Yet Moses was not the first revealer or *reveiler,* as Ragon well observes. Thousands of years before him Hermes was credited with veiling over the Indian mysteries to adapt them for the land of the Pharaohs. Of course, at present there is no longer classical authority to satisfy the orthodox philologist, but the occult authority which maintains that originally the word *revelare* meant to "veil once more," and hence that revelation means the throwing a veil over a subject, a *blind*—is positively overwhelming.

Now the Kabalistic meaning of the term "words" and "word" may be found in the *Zohar* and also in the *Talmud*. "Words" (*Dabarim*) mean "powers," and *word,* in the singular, is a synonym of Wisdom; *e.g.,* "By the uttering of *ten words* was the world created"—(*Talmud* "Pirkey Aboth" c.5., *Mish. 1*). Here the "words" refer to the ten sephiroth, Builders of the Universe. Again: "By the *Word* (Wisdom, Logos) of YHVH were the Heavens made" (*ibid.*).

2-4. "And the man[7] (the chief leader) said to his neighbour, 'Go to, let us make *bricks* (disciples) *and burn them to a burning* (initiate, fill them with sacred fire), let us build us a *city* (establish mysteries and teach *the* Doctrine[8]) and a *tower* (*Ziggurrat,* a sacred temple tower) whose top may reach unto heaven' " (the highest limit reachable in space). The great tower of Nebo, of *Nabi* on the temple of Bel, was called "the house of the seven spheres *of heaven and earth,*" and "the house of the stronghold (or strength, *tagimut*) and the foundation stone of heaven and earth."

Occult symbology teaches, that to *burn bricks for a city* means to train disciples for magic, a "hewn *stone*" signifying a *full* Initiate, *Petra* the Greek and *Kephas* the Aramaic word for stone, having the same meaning, *viz.,* "interpreter of the Mysteries," a *Hierophant.* The supreme initiation was referred to as "the burning with great burning." Thus, "the *bricks* are fallen, but we will *build* (anew) with hewn stones" of Isaiah becomes clear. For the true interpretation of the four last verses of the genetic allegory about the supposed "confusion of *tongues*" we may turn to the legendary version of the *Yezidis* and read verses 5, 6, 7, and 8 in *Genesis,* ch. xi, esoterically:—

"And *Adonai* (the Lord) came down and said: 'Behold, the people *is* one (the people are united in thought and deed) and they have *one lip* (doctrine).' And now they begin to spread it and 'nothing will be restrained from them (they will have full magic powers and get all they want by such power, Kriyasakti) *that they have imagined'.*"

And now what are the Yezidis and their version and what is Adonai? Ad is "the Lord," their ancestral god; and the Yezidis are a heretical Mussulman sect, scattered over Armenia, Syria, and especially Mosul, the very site of Babel (see "Chaldean Account of Genesis"),

---

[7] This is translated from the Hebrew original. "Chief-leader" (*Rab-Mag*) meaning literally Teacher-Magician, Master or *Guru,* as Daniel is shown to have been in Babylon.

[8] Some Homeric heroes also when they are said, like Laomedon, Priam's father, to have built cities, were in reality establishing the *Mysteries* and introducing the Wisdom-Religion in foreign lands.

who are known under the strange name of "Devil-worshippers." Their confession of faith is very original. They recognise two powers or gods—Allah and Ad, (or Ad-onai) but identify the latter with Sheitan or Satan. This is but natural since Satan is also "a son of god"[9] (see Job I). As stated in the *Hibbert Lectures* (pp. 346 and 347), Satan the "Adversary," was the minister and *angel of God.* Hence, when questioned on the cause of their curious worship of one who has become the embodiment of Evil and the dark spirit of the Earth, they explain the reason in a most logical, if irreverent, manner. They tell you that Allah, being *All-good,* would not harm the smallest of his creatures. *Ergo,* has he no need of prayers, or burnt-offerings of the "firstlings of the flock and the fat thereof." But that their Ad, or the Devil, being *All-bad,* cruel, jealous, revengeful and proud, they have, in self-preservation, to propitiate him with sacrifices and burnt offerings smelling sweet in his nostrils, and to coax and flatter him. Ask any Sheik of the Yezidis of Mosul what they have to say, as to the confusion of tongues, or speech when *Allah* "came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men had builded"; and they will tell you it is not Allah but *Ad,* the god Sheitan, who did it. The jealous genius of the earth became envious of the powers and sanctity of men (as the god Vishnu becomes jealous of the great powers of the *Yogis,* even when they were Daityas); and therefore this deity of matter and concupiscence confused their brains, tempted and made the "Builders" fall into his nets; and thus, having lost their purity, they lost therewith

---

[9] It is commanded in *Ecclesiasticus* XXI, 30, not to curse Satan, "lest one should forfeit his own life." Why? Because in their permutations "the Lord God," Moses, and Satan *are one.* The name the Jews gave while in Babylon to their *exoteric* God, the substitute for the *true* Deity of which they never spoke or wrote, was the Assyrian *Mosheh* or *Adar,* the god of the scorching sun (the "Lord thy God *is* a consuming *flame*" verily!) and therefore, Mosheh or Moses, *shone* also. In Egypt, Typhon (Satan) the *red,* was identified both with the red Ass or Typhon called Set or Seth (and worshiped by the Hittites) and the same as *El* (the Sun god of the Assyrians and the Semites, or Jehovah), and with Moses, the red, also. (See *Isis Unv.* Vol. II, 523-24.) For Moses was red-skinned. According to the *Zohar* (Vol. I, p. 28) *B' sar d' Mosheh soomaq, i.e.,* "the flesh of Moses was *deep red,*" and the words refer to the saying. "The face of Moses was like the face of the Sun" (see *Qabbalah* by Isaac Myer, p. 93). These three were the *three aspects* of the manifested God (the substitute for *Ain Soph* the infinite Deity) or Nature, in its three chief Kingdoms—the Fiery or Solar, the Human or Watery, the Animal or Earthy. There never was a *Mosheh* or Moses, before the Captivity and Ezra, the deep Kabalist; and what is now Moses had another name 2,000 years before. Where are the Hebrew scrolls before that time? Moreover, we find a corroboration of this in Dr. Sayce's *Hibbert Lectures* (1887). Adar is the Assyrian "War God" or the *Lord of Hosts* and the same as Moloch. The Assyrian equivalent of Mosheh (Moses) is *Masu,* the "double" or the "twin," and *Masu* is the title of Adar, meaning also a "hero." No one who reads carefully the said Lectures from page 40 to 58, can fail to see that Jehovah, Masu and Adar, with several others—are *permutations.*

their knowledge and magic powers, intermarried and became "scattered upon the face of the earth."

This is more logical than to attribute to one's "God," the *All-good,* such ungodly tricks as are fathered upon him in the Bible. Moreover, the legend about the tower of Babel and the confusion of *speech,* is like much else, not original, but comes from the Chaldeans and Babylonians. George Smith found the version on a mutilated fragment of the Assyrian tablets, though there is nothing said in it about the confusion of *speech.* "I have translated the word 'speech' with a prejudice," he says (*Chaldean Account of Genesis,* p. 163), "I have never seen the Assyrian word with this meaning." Anyone who reads for himself the fragmentary translation by G. Smith, on pages 160-163 in the volume cited, will find the version much nearer to that of the *Yezidis* than to the version of *Genesis.* It is he, whose "heart was evil" and who was "wicked," who confused "their counsel," not their "speech," and who broke "the Sanctuary . . . which carried Wisdom," and "bitterly they wept at Babel."

And so ought to "weep" all the philosophers and lovers of ancient Wisdom; for it is since then that the thousand and one exoteric substitutes for the one true Doctrine or *lip* had their beginning, obscuring more and more the intellects of men, and shedding innocent blood in fierce fanaticism. Had our modern philosophers studied, instead of sneering at, the old Books of Wisdom—say the *Kabala*—they would have found that which would have unveiled to them many a secret of ancient Church and State. As they have not, however, the result is evident. The dark cycle of *Kali Yug* has brought back *a Babel of modern thought,* compared with which the "confusion of tongues" itself appears a harmony. All is dark and uncertain; no argument in any department, neither in sciences, philosophy, law, nor even in religion. But, "woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness," saith Isaiah. The very elements seem confused and climates shift, as if the celestial "upper ten" themselves had lost their heads. All one can do is to sit and look on, sad and resigned, while

> The slack sail shifts from side to side;
> The boat untrimm'd admits the tide;
> Borne down adrift, at ramdom toss'd
> The oar breaks short . . . . . the rudder's lost.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

NOTES ON THE DHAMMAPADA

CANTO Nine of the *Dhammapada,* ominously entitled "Evil Conduct," affords an excellent opportunity for correlation with passages in Plato's *Republic.* This for the reason that, whenever discussing "sin" or "evil," Buddha affirms the view philosophers of the West have indentified as Socratic—that wrongdoing must be regarded as a form of ignorance. This is clearly suggested by verses four, five, and twelve:

> Even an evil doer sees happiness as long as his evil deed has not ripened; but when his evil deed has ripened, then does the evil doer perceive the evil.
>
> Even a good man, mayhap, suffers evil so long as his good deeds do not ripen; but when his good deeds ripen, then he perceives the good accruing to him.
>
> Not in the sky, nor in the depths of the sea, nor in mountain clefts is there a place on earth where a man can be to escape the consequences of his evil deed.

In both Plato and the sayings of the Buddha, identification of soul-ignorance as the cause of "evil conduct" is clearly designed to foster an affirmative attitude towards one's fellow beings, whatever their frailties. Since neither Buddha nor Plato were in any sense moralistic or condemnatory, they seldom invite discussion on the mysterious question of what "evil" may be *besides "ignorance";* however, we also can determine that neither of these great teachers was oblivious to the fact that there is a perverse capacity for harmful motivation in man—ignorance of quite another sort than that which leads to ordinary bungling of experiences and normal worldly confusion. The first verse of chapter nine, for instance, sounds as if Buddha is about to begin a moralistic treatise when he writes that "a man should hasten towards the good; he should restrain his evil thoughts; if he is slack in doing good his mind inclines to delight in evil." One might even wonder if this is but another and more temperate approach to the concept of original sin! For why should Buddha state that a man who is slack in doing good will automatically incline to delight in evil?

Were not the structure of evolutionary progress through innumerable incarnations also present in Buddha's teaching, such a statement might well lead his disciples to suspect that man is naturally *more* inclined to evil than to good. But if the whole of humanity is thought

of as on a progressive evolutionary journey, one can see that the man who makes no positive effort towards self-improvement, who undertakes no apprenticeship to virtue, will lose touch with the meaning of the forward march of progress. Gradually separated from those of his fellows who are, through at least intermittent efforts, striving toward a wider perspective, his will is set in opposition to the very idea of progress. At this time he becomes vindictive, vengeful—an exploiter alike of his own sensual propensities and of his fellow men.

One cannot—and this is demonstrable—merely stand still, as if in a vacuum. The very fact of *being* a man makes imperative continuous ethical decision, and the avoidance of such choices exacts a fair price in terms of a consequent beclouding of vision. So the tenuous conception of motive does indeed enter into the question of evil, even in Buddha, even in Plato. In verse ten, Buddha indicates this in a different context by stating that "whoever wrongs an innocent person, or a pure and sinless one, evil recoils on that fool, even as fine dust thrown against the wind recoils on the person throwing it." The pure in heart, whatever their incidental mistakes, escape the harsh judgment of karma because they refuse to retain the idea of retaliation. Always there are those who respect purity of motive in others and who rise to protect the latter when an effort is made to victimize them by oppression. Thus the wrong committed against an innocent person is apt to immediately "recoil on the person throwing it." Thus "he whose hand has no wound may touch poison. Poison harms not one who has no wound. No evil is to him who does no evil."

In the second book of Plato's *Republic* we discover that Plato develops the same idea, for Socrates asserts, and endeavors to prove, that justice is concerned "not with the outward man, but with the inward, which is the true self." Socrates then continues:

> The just man does not permit the several elements within him to interfere with one another, or any of them to do the work of others,—he sets in order his own inner life, and is his own master and his own law, and at peace with himself; and when he has bound together the three principles within him, which may be compared to the higher, lower, and middle notes of the scale, and the intermediate intervals—when he has bound all these together, and is no longer many, but has become one entirely temperate and perfectly adjusted nature, then he proceeds to act, if he has to act, whether in a matter of property, or in the treatment of the body, or in some affair of politics or private business; always thinking and calling that which preserves and

cooperates with this harmonious condition, just and good action, and the knowledge which presides over it, wisdom, and that which at any time impairs this condition, he will call unjust action, and the opinion which presides over it ignorance.

In the ninth book Plato develops a conception of the dual nature of man by way of imagery. Thrasymachus has been arguing that only the appearance and not the exercise of virtue is profitable, but Socrates endeavors to prove that the man who is not virtuous desecrates his own nature. Socrates speaks of man as being in part a beast, and in part a being of mind with all the marvelous powers of a god-like creator. He continues, suggesting that the total man is a blending of both—and, at first, an inharmonious blend:

Fashion them into a single image, as of a man, so that he who is not able to look within, and sees only the outer hull; and may believe the beast to be a single human creature.

I have done so, he said.

And now, to him who maintains that it is profitable for the human creature to be unjust, and unprofitable to be just, let us reply that, if he be right, it is profitable for this creature to feast the multitudinous monster, and strengthen the lion and the lion-like qualities, but to starve and weaken the man, who is consequently liable to be dragged about at the mercy of either of the other two; and he is not to attempt to familiarize or harmonize them with one another—he ought rather to suffer them to fight and bite and devour one another.

Certainly, he said; that is what the approver of injustice says.

To him the supporter of justice makes answer that he should ever so speak and act as to give the man within him in some way or other the most complete mastery over the entire human creature. He should watch over the many-headed monster like a good husbandman, fostering and cultivating the gentle qualities, and preventing the wild ones from growing; he should be making the lion-heart his ally, and in common care of them all should be uniting the several parts with one another and with himself.

Yes, he said, that is quite what the maintainer of justice will say.

And so from every point of view, whether of pleasure, honour, or advantage, the approver of justice is right and speaks the truth, and the disapprover is wrong and false and ignorant.

Yes, from every point of view.

So here, again, we find recognition of the fact that there is some truth in asserting man's propensity to evil if no mental discipline is undertaken, although it is clearly Plato's conviction that the direction of intent can be changed. He concludes by recommending that we "gently

reason with the unjust, who is not intentionally in error. 'Sweet Sir,' we will say to him, 'what think you of things esteemed noble and ignoble? Is not the noble that which subjects the beast to the man, or rather to the god in man; and the ignoble that which subjects the man to the beast?' He can hardly avoid saying yes—can he now?"

The central difference between the ethical philosophy of Buddha and Plato and those who cling to the doctrine of original sin is that both Buddha and Plato believe man may be educated away from any "propensity for evil." Nor is this education wondrous or particularly difficult—any more difficult, at least, than learning the great truths of evolutionary law. One expects the "evil" man to be at all times ready for some progress in this kind of education; therefore no "sinner" is ever entirely beyond the pale. Redemption is not attained after a proper amount of knowledge has been gained; knowledge *is* redemption, and every man is ready for more knowledge simply because he is a man.

The Moral Arbiter

Of all the wonderful elements of man's nature, none seems to me so marvellous as the conscience, the sense of duty, the recognition of a law which binds us, the acknowledgement of an eternal difference between what is right and what is wrong.

The conception of duty can never be derived from any external objects: it can never be deduced from the sensations nor from the emotions or the passions; but independently of them, often in antagonism to them, there is ever heard this still small voice; this mentor that claims an absolute obedience from, and superiority over, all the other faculties of man. It may be overborne, it may be neglected, but it can never be utterly extinguished, and it never abates one jot or tittle of its claim to be supreme.

Many things may be accounted for by the habits and customs of men through the long ages of time—things that have been done by imitation from age to age; but no such origin can account for the sense of right and wrong, for this sense constantly sits in judgment and passes condemnation on these habits and customs, and by no process of evolution can you get the law out of the crime or the judge out of the criminal.

—Sir Edward Fry

IS THERE A LAW OF COMPENSATION?

WHEN a man asks the question, "Is there a Law of Compensation?" providing he asks the question honestly and does not simply mean that he hopes his enemies will be punished and his own unrecognized goodness rewarded, he immediately enters the current of Theosophical thought. For the inquiry about a *law* of compensation means an inquiry into whether there is true continuity of meaning in life.

We are aware of a certain measure of continuity of meaning from day to day, and we know that psychological striving, like physical striving, brings rewards; our success in achieving a measure of self-knowledge is built upon the realization that this is so. But to inquire into the possible existence of a *law* of compensation means that we are prepared to have faith in the experience of the soul as being *always* continuous, as *always* having meaning. A rational faith in such a law provides courage to which we can attach our most remote aspirations, and it is in this sense that the doctrine of Karma becomes a true gospel of salvation.

There is nothing so important in distinguishing man from animal, nothing which describes the nature of the human soul better, than the phrase "a sense of justice." Above all other human qualities, we find this capacity enthroned. For justice is the true compassion—a feeling of impartial consideration for the needs of others. To live in accordance with a conception of ethical justice, moreover, means that we are able to separate the human individuality, or essential character, from our purely personal predilections and desires. For the just man is the man who is just in evaluating himself; he is a man who is capable of acquiring self-knowledge. And, as we know from all the scriptures as well as from our own hearts, there is no wisdom that is not rooted in self-knowledge.

Impartiality, then, is a signification of the highest, the true divinity, that impersonal reality which each man *is* in his deepest being. So when we really ask questions about compensation, and mean by that a desire to find a law of perfect continuity, a law of balance, we are then finding ourselves.

Many people who are now familiar with ethical usage of the term "compensation" first encountered this meaning in one of Emerson's essays. Emerson, clearly, was a natural theosophist, one of the precursors of the Theosophical Movement of 1875. In the beginning of "Compensation," Emerson remarks that ever since he had been a child he desired to write something about a "law of compensation." And, in his later years, it seemed apparent to him that even a child has a capacity for understanding the idea. Emerson believed that each man is always building in the direction of his future in *all* departments of his being; that reward and punishment are therefore, in a certain sense, immediate; that it is impossible for a man to do evil and not experience contemporary effects through alteration of his own character. Emerson also believed that it is impossible for a man to strive for good and not find himself possessed of an ever greater capacity for giving of himself to others.

But Emerson was also reflecting, at the time of writing "Compensation," on the discrepancy between a natural idea of justice and the conventional doctrines of reward and punishment in after-death states. In listening to a sermon, he was appalled to realize that what the orthodox Christian of the day hearkened to was a doctrine which taught that anything we presently desire and cannot obtain may be attained after death; that the things we have been prevented by circumstance from doing or achieving will all be possible, *providing* we have followed the right rules and stipulations, and while professing a faith which enables us to be called Christians.

But look at this for a moment, said Emerson. Do we see what this teaching implies? Has a man ever been entirely prevented from giving of himself to others? Does circumstance ever prevent a man from desiring to learn, prevent him from transforming his own nature? Is there ever a time when one cannot practice human compassion? Now if compassion, love, and self-mastery are the true virtues, these can be striven for and realized at any time. Of course, *if* we assume that the "goods" of life are to have much of "venison and wine," wealth and prestige, we can presently suffer frustration, and desire heaven as a means of allaying it.

According to Emerson, the logic is inescapable. What the Christian who speaks in these terms is saying, whether he knows it or not, is that in heaven we will have the pleasures which were denied to us here. But if heaven is thought to be a high and noble state, why not think

that man reaches "heaven" as soon as he is *able* to be compassionate, when he is able to transform himself, when he is able to strive for the highest; these higher aspirations and devotions can never be blocked by circumstances.

If we consult a dictionary on the meaning of "compensation," we discover some interesting things; there it is remarked that, while in the general sense "compensation" means an equitable return—good for good, evil for evil—it also suggests, in the terms of mechanics, a synchronization, a bringing together into harmony of many delicately moving parts. Achieving compensation is a matter of timing, of settling internal disharmony.

So it is with man. "Karma" is simply a description of the adjustment which each man is encouraged by life's experiences to make with his own disequilibrium. And it follows from this that punishment for evil —an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—is not required. The selfish man, the man who injures others, may very well, by virtue of the associations which he builds, draw himself into a situation where he will experience in distressing fashion the result of his attitudes and behavior. Yet as one philosopher put it, what is required is simply that man learns. And since we know that the most selfish of men may be awakened by the presence of another who is *truly* unselfish, this also is a part of Karma. This is the way in which man transforms himself, when something from within his nature, or from without, elicits from him a different response from that which was previously characteristic. What we call "punishment," then, is simply an incidental reflection of disequilibrium. The Law of Compensation is beyond all punishment and all reward, having to do with the synchronizing and harmonizing of the discordant elements of human nature.

Another dictionary definition of compensation refers to physical or biological circumstance. And here we approach another of Emerson's points of emphasis in his essay on compensation. For in physical or biological terms, *compensation* refers to the capacity of an organism to develop, to a more heightened degree, one capacity to replace the loss of another. Emerson develops this thought by pointing out that every form of suffering *can* result in another and deeper sensitivity; that the fact of death, when it comes to us, while a sorrow, may also be the very means by which the door is equitably closed on one phase of our existence. The last page of a certain chapter turned, we then may be set moving in a new direction.

So much for sorrow and loss. As for the strokes of good fortune, these, too, Emerson suggests, are in converse fashion often productive of our trials and our sorrows. For the man possessed of a gift or a strength is, simply because he is a man, inevitably tempted to exert it beyond its balanced expression. Each virtue means, perhaps, to the man who has not attained sainthood, a complementary weakness.

These are philosophical perspectives, indicative of why the man who inquires about a law of compensation is truly searching for continuity in meaning. He wishes to re-affirm an intuitive faith that no trial or sorrow is too great, that all can be turned toward learning—also that no "perfection" is ever *perfect.* Such an inquirer believes deeply in an innate human capacity to envision and strive for justice or balance. When we turn to the writings of Plato, we find that always, in speaking through the lips of that just Athenian, Socrates, he says that the sage is simply the "just man": there is no greatness without justice. Plato, however, takes the discussion into another dimension, which brings us to another aspect of Theosophical philosophy, which is the conception of Karma as "reward." For, in having Socrates argue with Thrasymachus about "fortune," he points out that some seem to suffer all their days at the hands of society, even though they are good men; they may be suspected of every evil, yet be truly virtuous. Others, truly evil men, acquire the appearance of virtue, pass as virtuous, and are rewarded with public esteem. Thrasymachus thinks these facts preclude justice, but Socrates suggests that there must be other levels for the soul on which both virtue and vice ultimately find expression.

Socrates admits that if the sufferings and joys of life are to be measured only in terms of a short span of years, then indeed, as Thrasymachus claimed, it might be sensible to strive for the mere *appearance* of virtue and goodness—worry not about whether the quality is actually attained. But *if* there are other lives for the soul, if this present existence is but one chapter in a long story, then it is only natural to suppose that the soul will draw itself to new experiences in accordance with its true nature. Appearances, after all, are but layers of personality, placed upon and around the essential character of the soul. This, after all, is Plato's central argument, and the core of his whole perspective. Unfathomed and unrecognized by many contemporary philosophers, it is yet here we discover the secret of Plato's identity as a Theosophical teacher.

In a study of the doctrine of Karma, we come the closest to some-

thing "demonstrable" in Theosophical doctrine. The teaching of reincarnation is primarily a suggestive perspective, not something which we may prove in logical or experimental terms—in and of itself simply not a doctrine susceptible of proof. But the doctrine of Karma *is* demonstrable—demonstrable in psychological terms. The psychologist, for instance, knows the basic reality of Karma. In dealing with various stages of personality dislocations, he is able to see that the emotion of hostility, for instance, can never be productive of anything save human misery. "Hostility," then, can never be regarded as justifiable, and there is no such thing as *righteous* anger, if, in using this term, we mean to include a measure of hate, a desire to injure those who are presumed transgressors of proper conduct. Psychologists recognize that men need not bother to punish each other—that the man who is in psychological difficulty punishes himself. The man who knows not how to give of himself, to "love," cannot be loved. On this view, it is impossible at any level of human experience, to attain that which we have not earned, because the things that we desire the most can only arrive for *us* if there is that in our nature capable of receiving it.

This demonstration is impressive because it comes out of the crucible of human misery. It comes at a time when, as we know, the statistics of mental disorder increase from year to year, when it is plain that there is something in man which is striving incoherently for more than he can presently find. Yet we still live in a psychological atmosphere provided by a past wherein religion taught self-righteousness and imposed arbitrary moralities. Moralistic values lead to superficial standards of values, and since these lead to a contradiction between the highest ethical insight—of which man is sometimes capable—and the standards around us, we have a perfect ground for what is called "neurosis," or a splitting and a confusing of the personality.

The discovery of Karma suggests that there is no reward or punishment which man does not bring to himself; that there is no full and final injustice. And yet, we can be sympathetic concerning the various "heavens" which have somehow become attached to the doctrines of great teachers. There is the heaven of the Christians and the Devachan of the Hindus, and in both we have an after-life of joy and blessedness envisioned in both representations. This is because there is always more to man, to his dreams and visions and aspirations, than that which he is able to bring to focus at any given time. So the desire to experience fulfillments, or even the fact that there are within him unfulfilled

aspirations, leads inevitably to the imagining of a state where, at least for a time, our aspirations will not be blocked by the conflicting personalities of others, discouraging happenings, and so forth.

This, then, brings us to an examination of those states after death described in the doctrines re-presented by H. P. Blavatsky, which are indicative of the many subtleties involved in the progress of the soul from death to birth again. For we have not only the essential soul, the soul which neither grieves nor enjoys in the usual sense, but *becomes* and *is* more all the time; we often also center our minds upon purely personal fulfilments. Our personal aspirations are not necessarily ignoble, nor sinful. Every desire is capable, though often only after some sort of refinement, of incorporation into profound meaning for the soul. So the higher desires, in *devachan* and *kama-loca,* find their fulfilment. This fulfilment is as that of a dream—a dream, however, which has nothing to do with punishing the wicked, nor with the presumed establishment of one's own righteousness, for these feelings do not belong to our higher aspirations at all. Such utterly selfish partisanship has its field in the nether world which precedes emergence of the soul into *devachan.* Thus, behind the conception of "heaven" lies the reality of a subjective state which man builds out of his own longings and imaginings. Such a state must last as long as the energy expended in their construction endures. Later, the soul, no longer concerned with these personal fulfilments, is free again. Then the essential being, the essential character, is drawn back again to birth—always according to the tenor of thought established in a prior life.

We see, then, the full circle of compensation as described by any philosophy which is based upon a respect for man's capacity for justice. We see that every element of the personal life, and every element of the aspiring life, has its fulfilment, in time. We can suggest, then, as did Emerson, that the attainments most clearly representative of the soul-nature of man bring immediate reward—an expansion of vision, an enlargement of perspective, a tendency away from the arbitrary, from the self-righteous, from the envious. In the terms of the *Tao Te King,* this is the recognition that the Tao is the "real" everywhere; that it is not the reward and punishment of men that should concern us—our own the least of all. The law of compensation is the law of life, the necessity for synchronizing or harmonizing the various elements of our own natures.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK – AND ANSWER

IT is often said that one of the main contributions of great teachers is that of setting us an example. But if we do follow the example of someone we are learning from, the question arises as to whether we are imitating that person instead of becoming self-reliant.

(*a*) What really happens when a person imitates someone he looks up to? Though he should admire the *way* this teacher does something, and *why* he does it, usually a pupil does not understand a teacher well enough and therefore copies the personality instead of the teacher's striving.

It is an art to be both a good teacher and a good pupil. Some great teachers master so many virtues that these alone are enough to teach us a great deal. They not only teach their principles, but are a living example, in practice, of their principles. In such a case it actually is hard to distinguish between what such a man teaches and what he does. And if one follows such teachings, it *looks* as if one is simply following or imitating the teacher, personally.

Then there are teachers whose "path is hard to trace." The seventh chapter of the *Dhammapada,* called "The Sage," has two verses which describe such a teacher very beautifully:

> Those who have no possessions, who nourish themselves according to knowledge and who realize the goal of freedom by perceiving that life is empty and transient, their path is hard to trace like the flight of birds through the sky.
>
> He whose appetites are slain and who is indifferent to food, who has perceived the goal of freedom by realizing that life is empty and transient, his path is hard to trace like the flight of birds through the sky.

To learn to become self-reliant, we have first to become unprejudiced towards everyone and everybody, even ourselves. Then we can dwell within and listen to our own voice. Once we know at least a little bit what we really are, we will also know what we are not *yet,* and with that comes the realization of what we have to learn. This way we gain a sense of discrimination and can see what we can learn from others—especially from wise people—without just following them whatever they do. Very often we can avoid imitating someone if we don't get too

personally involved, but maintain an impersonal relationship between teacher and pupil. Then both can learn from each other and form, on the basis of mutual principles, a unity.

(*b*) There might be considered to be two classes of those who are our "teachers," the one being those whom we call "Great Beings," who come to teach mankind about a secret side of life that is still undiscovered by the majority of men. These teachers are of varying degrees of greatness and stature. But still they are far above the average stature. Then there are those people with whom we simply find an affinity, those toward whom we are drawn in a somewhat psychic way. Such also are our karmic teachers. It would seem that when we have any personal contact with those from whom we find ourselves learning, this element of psychic contact with the personality of the teacher cannot be altogether overlooked, and should be understood. It is for us to see *through* the personality, not ignore it. Thus we may very well find ourselves imitating a person for a time, instead of being self-reliant; but if this is a stage of which we are conscious, "hero-worship" is then perhaps not so terrible. Just as long as the person is forever struggling to learn what is basically true in any situation and trying to be more self-reliant in attitude, then he is progressing, slowly perhaps, but nevertheless going forward.

Robert Crosbie stated: "Those who are able to perceive, to understand, and to use what They gave have no reason to deviate or dilute anything to suit contemporary forms or ideas, nor to bolster up a decadence that pollutes the mental atmosphere of men." One could read this to mean that the role of ULT in the Theosophical Movement is to disseminate exclusively the written teachings as given, but was this exclusive meaning necessarily intended?

Here and there one hears the statement that H.P.B. contradicts herself in some of her teachings. This can seem to be the case if we regard those statements superficially, but it would then be wise to keep on digging in order to finally arrive at a more complete meaning which may transcend apparent contradiction. If, however, this strenuous path is not pursued, the seemingly "only out" is to refer to other teachings which, naturally, have certain truths, but, on the other hand, also contain fallacies. H.P.B. did not say in vain that Theosophy is an assemblage of all religions, containing *only the truths* of all teachings, and is therefore to be regarded as the Wisdom Religion.

It is not difficult to see that in the early days of ULT a fairly exclusive meaning might have been intended as a basic orientation. Hand-in-glove with the quotation in the question are the two following ones: "Theosophy is for those who want it and none others"; and the declaration to spread broadcast "Theosophy, pure and simple." For in those days, following the many successions, schisms, and splits of the original Theosophical Society, the infant ULT had to fight long and hard to rejuvenate the original lines laid down. It was a transition period for the organizational aspect of the current Theosophical Movement, and hence the emphasis on the "pure philosophy" and on impersonality in its obvious sense.

The Lodge has been in existence some forty odd years, and it doesn't seem too bold to say that the area of the work has broadened considerably—and, for that matter, must broaden even more in certain respects in order to stay abreast with the "larger" Theosophical Movement spoken of by Wm. Q. Judge. Otherwise, without the "progressive spirit," the greater Theosophical Movement will leave ULT in its wake. Continual emphasis must be placed on the Fundamental Propositions, but at the same time, the spirit to be gleaned from a thorough consideration of H.P.B.'s great articles must be applied. In one of these articles, she stated that what was needed during that period was "Theosophical literature, and by that I do not mean volumes on Theosophical doctrine." The first chapter of the revised edition of *The Theosophical Movement* defines the ever-continuing Theosophical Movement simply and generally as any and all manifestations of the soul in mankind attempting new expressions of freedom and higher awareness; and certainly ULT does not qualify under this definition unless it also correspondingly and continually grows.

If one could "give away" truth and knowledge and the real meanings and explanations of the teachings, it would be the duty and role of ULT in the Theosophical Movement to disseminate exclusively the written teachings as given. But it is well known that this is not the case, that "the kingdom of heaven must be taken by violence." It is therefore, in my opinion, not intended that ULT should disseminate exclusively the written teachings as given, but should also help each newcomer to Theosophy and every student who seems to have difficulty in comprehending the true teachings of Theosophy to find practical meaning in those teachings.

THE FREE AGENT

THE spirit in man is the only real and permanent part of his being, the rest of his nature being variously compounded. Everything in man but his spirit is impermanent. Unless the Ego takes refuge in the Atman, the All-Spirit, and merges entirely into the essence thereof, the personal ego may goad it to the bitter *end.* When egoism is allied to the body in attachment, a daughter is born in the form of desire. This daughter, when grown up is mated to hatred. The child of this marriage, nursed by the grandparent in the form of pride, is the reaction to pleasure and pain. This active and negative principle is fattened by hope and is violently opposed to courage and self-control. Inebriated by discontent, the monster seeks delight in the chamber of sensuality. It spreads the thorns of doubt in the path of pure devotion and cuts out many a by-path with evil deeds.

The intellectual portion of mankind seems to be fast dividing into two classes: the one unconsciously preparing for itself long periods of temporary annihilation or states of non-consciousness, owing to the deliberate surrender of intellect and its imprisonment in the narrow grooves of bigotry and superstition—a process which cannot fail to lead to the utter deformation of the intellectual principle. The other portion unrestrainedly indulging its animal propensities with the deliberate intention of submitting to annihilation pure and simple, in case of failure, and to milleniums of degradation after physical dissolution.

Creative powers in man were the gift of divine wisdom, not the result of sin. The demon of pride, lust, rebellion, and hatred, has never had any being before the appearance of physical conscious man. It is man who has begotten, nurtured, and allowed the fiend to develop in his heart. He, again, who has contaminated the indwelling god in himself, by linking the pure spirit with the impure demon of matter. The intellectual evolution, in its progress hand-in-hand with the physical, has certainly been a curse instead of a blessing—a gift quickened by the Lords of Wisdom, who have poured on the human *manas* the fresh dew of their own spirit and essence. Spirituality is on the ascending arc, and the animal or physical impedes it from steadily progressing on the path of its evolution only when the selfishness of the personality

---

NOTE:—Collated from standard Theosophical sources.

has so strongly infected the real inner man with its lethal virus, that the upward attraction has lost all its power on the thinking, reasonable man.

The world in general, and Christendom especially, left for 2,000 years to the regime of a personal God, as well as to its political and social systems based on that idea, has now proved a failure. No religion, with the exception of Buddhism, has taught a practical contempt for this earthly life; while each of them, always with that one solitary exception, has through its hells and damnations inculcated the greatest dread of death and the future. Conventional religions have failed to greatly extend their areas, reform abuses, reorganize society, expand the idea of brotherhood, abate discontent, diminish crime, and elevate humanity; and an apparent inadequacy to realize in individual lives the idea they professedly uphold. The unit of the race, the individual, is faced with the choice either to allow his fate to be decided for him through the channels of institutionalism, or to take it into his own hands. There is said to be such a "moment of choice" not yet come, which will affect the race as a whole. But the individual has power to hasten the advent of this moment. After the period for the race is past, the race tends toward its dissolution.

Says H. P. Blavatsky: "In sober truth, vice and wickedness are an abnormal, unnatural manifestation at this period of our human evolution—at least they ought to be. The fact that mankind was never more selfish and vicious than it now is, civilized nations having succeeded in making of the first an ethical characteristic, of the second an art, is an additional proof of the exceptional nature of the phenomenon." The civilizations of the present day are selfish to the last degree. If there are those who wish to hear truth, they must devote themselves to truth and leave all considerations of earthly gain out of sight. *Mystical* Christianity teaches self-redemption through one's own seventh principle, the liberated Paramatma, called by the one Christ, by others Buddha. This is equivalent to regeneration or rebirth in spirit. It expounds therefore the same truth as the Nirvana of Buddhism. All of us have to get rid of our own Ego, the illusory, apparent self, to recognize our true Self, in a transcendent divine life. The day when the Church will find that its only salvation lies in the *occult* interpretation of the Bible, may not be so far off as some imagine.

If there was an "Original Sin," it was committed in the Third and Fourth races. But the sin was not in using the newly developed powers,

but in misusing them; in making of the tabernacle, designed to contain a god, the fane of every *spiritual* iniquity. In the case of the Atlanteans it was precisely the Spiritual being which sinned, the Spirit element being still the "master" principle in man, in those days. Thus it is in those days that the heaviest Karma of the Fifth race was generated by our Monads. The curse of Karma was not called down for seeking *natural* union, as all the mindless animal-world does in its proper season—but for abusing the creative power, for desecrating the divine gift, and wasting the life-essence for no purpose except bestial personal gratification. The great Adepts who remain with mankind, say that the state of creating—not begetting—will return to mankind and to the world at large when the latter shall discover and really appreciate the truths which underlie this vast problem of sex. "The great Adepts and Initiated ascetics will 'multiply', *i.e.,* once more produce *Mind-born* immaculate Sons—in the Seventh root-race."

The first law of "Time" is that the order of the successive and harmonious phases in the process of evolution, during cyclic development, should be strictly preserved—under the severe penalty of abnormal growth with all its ensuing results. It was not in the programme of natural development that man—higher animal though he may be—should become at once, intellectually, spiritually, and psychically, the demi-god he is on earth, while his physical frame remains weaker and more helpless and ephemeral than that of almost any huge mammal. The contrast is too grotesque and violent; the tabernacle much too unworthy of its indwelling god. The "gift of Prometheus" thus becomes a Curse—though foreseen and foreknown by the Host personified in that personage, as his name well shows. It is in this that rests, at one and the same time, its sin and its redemption. For the Host that incarnated in a portion of humanity, though led to it by Karma and *Nemesis,* preferred free-will to passive slavery, intellectual self-conscious pain and even torture—"while myriad time shall flow"—to inane, imbecile, instinctual beatitude. While saving man from mental darkness, the Host inflicted upon him the tortures of the self-consciousness of his responsibility—the result of his free-will—besides every ill to which mortal man and flesh are heir to. This torture Prometheus accepted for himself, since the Host became henceforth blended with the tabernacle prepared, which was still unachieved at that period of formation.

Man on earth is an animal *plus a living god* within his physical shell. "Man will rebecome the *free* Titan of old, but not before cyclic evo-

lution has re-established the broken harmony between the two natures —the terrestrial and the divine."

When one falls into a love of self and love of the world, with its pleasures, losing the divine love of God and of the neighbor, he falls from life to death. The higher principles which constitute the essential elements of his humanity perish, and he lives only on the natural plane of his faculties. Physically he exists, spiritually he is dead. To all that pertains to the higher and the only enduring phase of existence he is as much dead as his body becomes dead to all the activities, delights, and sensations of the world when the spirit has left it. This spiritual death results from disobedience of the laws of spiritual life, which is followed by the same penalty as the disobedience of the laws of natural life. But the spiritually dead have still their delights; they have their intellectual endowments and power, and intense activities. All the animal delights are theirs, and to multitudes of men and women these constitute the highest ideal of human happiness. The tireless pursuit of riches, of the amusements and entertainments of social life; the cultivation of graces of manner, of taste in dress, of social preferment, of scientific distinction, intoxicate and enrapture these dead-alive; but a high development of the intellectual faculties does not imply spiritual and true life. Many of our greatest scientists are but animate corpses —they have no true spiritual sight because their spirits have left them. So we might go through all the ages, examine all occupations, weigh all human attainments, and investigate all forms of society, and we would find these *spiritually dead* everywhere.

To illustrate our case mathematically, we may designate the spirit as the centrifugal, and the soul as the centripetal, spiritual energies. When in perfect harmony both forces produce one result; break or damage the centripetal motion of the earthly soul tending toward the center which attracts it; arrest its progress by clogging it with a *heavier weight of matter* than it can bear, and the harmony of the whole, which was its life, is destroyed. Individual life can only be continued if sustained by this two-fold force. The least deviation from harmony damages it; when it is destroyed beyond redemption the forces separate and the form is gradually annihilated. The deliberate choosers of evil, whose lives are passed in great spiritual wickedness, for evil done for the sheer love of evil *per se*—sever the connection with the Divine Spirit, or the Monad, which forever abandons the human Ego. After the death of the depraved and the wicked, arrives the critical

moment. If during life the ultimate and desperate effort of the inner self to reunite with the faintly glimmering ray of its divine parent is neglected; if this ray is allowed to be more and more shut out by the thickening crusts of matter, the soul, once freed from the body, follows its earthly attractions, and is magnetically drawn into and held within the dense fogs of the material atmosphere.

Then it begins to sink lower and lower, until it finds itself, when returned to consciousness, in what the ancients termed Hades, or *Avitchi.* The annihilation of such a soul is never instantaneous; it may last centuries, perhaps; for nature never proceeds by jumps and starts, and the astral soul being formed of the elements, the law of evolution must bide its time. Then begins the fearful law of compensation, the *Yin-youan* of the Buddhists. Such Egos pass into the misery and waiting of the "eighth sphere"—until the separation is complete.

Such Egos, ceasing to be human, become of the class called the "earthly elementary." These are the enemy of the human family. "Cunning, low, vindictive, and seeking to retaliate their sufferings upon humanity, they become, until final annihilation, vampires, ghouls, and prominent actors on the great stage of spiritualism." Their power and influence, wherever ingress into human mind and soul can be made, is great. "One day," says Porphyry, "they will employ brute force; another cunning. . . . It is child's play for them to arouse in us vile passions, to impart to societies and nations turbulent doctrines, provoking wars, seditions, and other public calamities, and then tell you that 'all is the work of the gods.' These spirits pass their time in cheating and deceiving mortals, creating around them illusions and prodigies; their greatest ambition is *to pass as gods and souls* (disembodied *Spirits*)." In the East they are known as the "Brothers of the Shadow."

Such a chapter, by those who know, has been written of the dark termination, the immortal ruin to which the soul on earth, the free agent, *may* lead his Pilgrimage.

Its Distinguishing Loss

This cycle is known as the dark one; in Sanskrit, Kali Yuga, or the black age. Revolving in the depths of material things and governed chiefly by the mind apart from spirit, its characteristic gain is physical and material progress, its distinguishing loss is in spirituality.

—William Q. Judge

ON THE LOOKOUT

"The Unknown—Is It Nearer?"

Under this title a recent Signet-Mentor pocket book offers summarizing discussions of the many classifications of psychic phenomena. As is the case with the two major works of J. B. Rhine, considerable value is to be gained by considering *all* known psychic phenomena as part of the same subject, since this is an invitation to discover essences and principles. An isolated "study" of any single paranormal field is all too apt to focus attention upon the phenomena and obscure the perception that what is really being encountered is the fabulous sensitivity-potential of all human beings. Reflecting something of the spirit of the early psychic investigators who participated in the work of the Theosophical Society—and in furthering the Third Object of the Theosophical Movement as conceived by H. P. Blavatsky—the two authors have performed a useful service. Eric J. Dingwall, Director of Physical Phenomena of the American Society for Psychical Research, and John Langdon-Davies, a respected science writer, combine talents for this enterprise, and have done a particularly good job in weighing the pros and cons of Spiritualism. Since the fascination of hypno-regression, à la Bridey Murphy, is now at its peak, we may well expect that traffic in séances will also increase. It is in this context that we commend passages such as the following:

Certainty of Willful Fate

> Organized Spiritualism, both in America and in Europe has grown into a new religion, with its beliefs, its rituals, its practices. Through séances, where mediums usually enter into trances, the faithful hope and believe that they are in contact with the Unknown. They claim to find in these things experimental proof of positive answers to our questions. Yes, there is life after death; yes, there is absent communication; yes, there are telepathy, clairvoyance, prophecy, and all the things which most human beings devoutly hope will turn out to be true.
>
> Although Spiritualism has undoubtedly given comfort to large numbers of people and can claim to have produced phenomena which an open-minded man will consider worthy of investigation, unfortunately throughout the whole history of the movement there has been so much innocent self-deception and cool, calculating fraud mixed up with what may possibly be true, that the evidence offered by Spirit-

ualist circles is almost worthless. However, to this day many people believe that they can get the answers they want from this source, and there are big Spiritualist alliances and hundreds of one-man independent churches everywhere.

Many Reasons for Contempt

Historical Spiritualism, then, has only led orthodox scientists to view the entire situation with contempt: "Nothing can be more deplorable than the silliness which some people, calling themselves Spiritualists, are prepared to believe; and the movement was never strong enough internally to create order out of chaos, to separate the chaff, of which there was much, from the grain, of which there usually seemed to be remarkably little."

The "Unknown" encroaches, however, despite the wishes of scientific men that the word be meaningless. J. W. Dunne's disciplined experiments in precognitive dreams, Rhine's work with both telepathy and clairvoyance, and the diverse activities of competent psychical research societies in both England and America, have succeeded in making the "paranormal" a fit subject for scientific study; Dingwall and Davies invite interested readers to turn to such sources for any personal investigations they may wish to undertake. While not entirely hostile to the idea of consulting mediums, Dingwall and Davies also "give a word of warning," stating that "it is doubtful whether there are 20 mediums worth consulting in the whole world."

A Balanced Perspective

The following formulation represents the intent of the authors:

> On the one hand, you will find the people who are opposed to the existence of all paranormal phenomena on principle and who, in spite of thus having prejudged the issue, still think they have a scientific attitude toward such problems. These will tell you that anything which seems to be a brush with the Unknown is really a matter of suggestion, and having issued this meaningless dogma they will shut their minds tight and ask that you do the same. On the other hand, you will find people who welcome with open arms anything, however faked, however silly, which can be used as evidence of the existence of their beloved spirits. Avoid both enemies by learning how to treat evidence as any scientist does (or should do): and take courage from the fact, which neither of these types can any longer deny, that out of the laboratory has come evidence that these brushes with the Unknown are not mere subjectivity, mere suggestion, even if every

noise made by a table is not evidence that our dear departed are in touch with us.

EXCAVATION UNCOVERS MONASTERY

In *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and The Essenes* (Macmillan, 1955), Prof. A. Dupont-Sommer assembles and discusses information gained in the three years since publication of his *Dead Sea Scrolls*: continuing excavation of the ruins near the Cave of Manuscripts has proved that they are not those of a Roman fort, as had been supposed, but the remains of a monastery; translation of one of the two scrolls found in the cave indicates that it was a monastery of the Essenes. The ruins show traces of fire, and the haphazard position of the pottery suggests hurried departure—presumably about A.D. 66, during the Jewish war. Everything indicates that the monastery was hastily abandoned, and the manuscripts placed in the cave for safe-keeping. Eleven tombs in the nearby cemetery have been opened. "These graves," says Dupont-Sommer, "are neither Muslim, nor Christian, nor those of pre-Islamic pagans. They are the tombs of the Essenes."

THE GNOSIS OF THE ESSENES

The published scroll contains the Manual of Discipline, the Habakkuk Commentary, and the Damascus Document. From a comparison of the Manual with other Hebraic manuscripts and the writings of Philo and Josephus, Prof. Dupont-Sommer concludes:

> The Gnosis of the Essenes appears as a mixture or synthesis in which elements of most varied origins are combined. This Gnosis, viewed from a general angle, is a highly typical example of the extraordinary fusion of the beliefs and rites of different religions which took place in the Hellenistic period. . . .
>
> Without any doubt this sect remained fundamentally Jewish. Its bases are the Law and the Prophets. The documents of Qumran repeatedly refer to them as the authentic origins of the Jewish faith. This Sect preserves all the mystic legacy of Israel's past. Yet their very fervour inspired them to seek and absorb all that was most elevated, noblest, and all-conquering in the pagan world of mysticism. Iran gave them the most powerful of its religious ideas; from Alexandria they imbibed the burning lava of reborn Pythagoreanism.

CHRISTIANITY AND ESSENISM

"On the fringe of the great Essene order in Palestine," writes Prof. Dupont-Sommer, "there existed other movements and other groups

which derived from the same mystic spirit, and were formed more or less on the same pattern, but to a greater or lesser extent either independent or even dissident." Despite the "numerous resemblances" between Christianity and Essenism, however, Prof. Dupont-Sommer states:

> Let it be said at once that: if the Jewish sect described by Philo and Josephus, *i.e.,* the Jewish Sect of the Covenant of the documents of Qumran, is called Essenism proper, then Christianity is not Essenism, any more than Essenism is Christianity, or Christianity in anticipation. . . . The sect of primitive Christians must in my view rather be ranked beside the sect of John the Baptist, among the many *quasi*-Essene sects which saw the light of Palestine in the course of the first century A.D. However important the borrowings may be which Christianity was able to make from Essenism properly speaking, Christianity is no copy or replica of Essenism.

The Two Teachers Contrasted

Prof. Dupont-Sommer further cautions against identifying The Teacher of Righteousness, of the Essenes, with Jesus. He says:

> The Teacher of Righteousness was the revealer of a mysterious Gnostic teaching, which had been developed with the aid of the most profound wisdoms then in circulation in the world, and which was reserved to the initiated; Jesus was, above all, a popular preacher, arisen from the circles of simple fold, who expressed himself in simple language with comparisons full of freshness and life. . . . The Teacher of Righteousness was, to put it boldly, a kind of Jewish Pythagoras; Jesus, at least in the Synoptic Gospels, does not have this character at all. He was a simple soul, naïvely in love with the highest mystical ideals, who leaned naturally and warm-heartedly towards God, without any learned theology. . . . Above all, it must not be forgotten that more than a century separates the two persons. The Teacher of Righteousness died about 65-63 B.C. . . . Jesus died about A.D. 30.

"Jewish Sect" and "Isis"

Although H.P.B. says little of the Essenes in *Isis,* she sketches an outline which remains unchanged as Prof. Dupont-Sommer fills in many details. Both authors quote Philo and Josephus as sources; both suggest that the Essenes are offshoots of the old Hermeticists; both emphasize the prescribed poverty and asceticism of the sect, its practice of itinerant proselytizing, and its "mysteries," hidden from all save the "elect," or initiated. Moreover, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran* contains copious quotations from the recently translated manuscript, giving

rules and regulations, traditional teachings, special rites and ceremonies, and the like, which—according to the author—"eloquently proclaim the ideas of *liberty, equality,* and *fraternity* in this society."

SESSIONS OF THE MANY

Since all were equal under the law, all took part in the Assembly of the Community. The texts are silent on how frequently the sessions were held, but the latter are described in some detail:

> Now this is the procedure for a Session of the Many. Everyone according to his rank! The priests shall sit down first, and the elders second, then the rest of all the people. Let them sit each according to his rank, and equally let them interrogate with regard to judgment and for all manner of counsel and of any matter which concerns the Many, each bringing his knowledge to the Council of the Community. No man shall interrupt the words of his fellow before the other has finished speaking. Neither shall he speak before his proper order, (before) he who is enrolled before you, (before)) the man who is being examined. Each shall speak in his turn. And in the Session of the Many no one shall speak any word which is not according to the pleasure of the Many, and at the request of the man who is the overseer of the Many. And every man who has something to say to the Many, if he is not in office, the man who wishes to examine the Council of the Community, this man shall rise to his feet and say: "I have something to say to the Many." If they bid him he shall speak.

Such strict equality of opportunity within a rigid traditional procedure suggests at least the influence of, if not an identity with, the old mystery schools.

RECENT DEAD SEA FINDS

A dispatch from the Israeli Sector of Jerusalem (Los Angeles *Examiner,* March 26) describes "a new find which bears a similarity to the Dead Sea Scrolls." Bits of pottery and a papyrus fragment were found in the newly excavated ruins of King Herod's palace on the southwestern shores of the Dead Sea. This new find confirms the age of the Dead Sea Scrolls as given by Prof. Dupont-Sommer. Dr. Yochanan Aharoni, an Israeli archeologist, further describes the excavations:

> The archeological mission found when clearing the palace several well-preserved walls painted with colored flowers and mathematical designs resembling the painted walls of Pompeii. In another part of the castle they discovered a 2000-year-old food storehouse with empty jars and an armory. . . . In the same region they discovered inside

a 500-foot high cliff a cave 108 feet long, 20 feet wide and 10 to 20 feet high. The cave had a secret water supply. Water flowed in from outside through an invisible and partly subterranean channel. It was stored in a plastered basin.

The Dead Sea Scrolls, then, and the archeological excavations that indicate their antiquity are of interest to the theosophical student as adding to the number of those fragments which, says H.P.B., "have survived geological and political cataclysms to tell the story; and every survival shows evidence tha the now *Secret* Wisdom was once the one fountain head, the ever-flowing perennial source, at which were fed all its streamlets—and later religions of all nations—from the first down to the last."

Bacteria Resist Miracle Drugs

A UP report (Fairbanks *New-Miner,* Nov. 9, 1955) states that "antibiotics are losing their punch." The item continues:

> Sad news from the health front is that penicillin and other antibiotics have lost some more of their magic against bacteria which sicken and sometimes kill us.
>
> Evidence of this has cropped up in the treatment of complicating bacterial diseases which commonly accompany measles. It appears to justify the belief of some scientists that the day will come when antibiotics have no magic left.
>
> Measles is a disease caused by a virus, and antibiotics have no effect on viruses. But the measles viruses make human beings susceptible to disease-causing bacteria, and in their heyday the antibiotics were highly effective in slaughtering bacteria.
>
> So it became rather usual for doctors to reason this way: Here's a simple case of measles, so I'll keep it simple and prevent any bacteria from causing complications—like bronchial pneumonia or an ear infection—by giving the patient an antibiotic here and now.

Adaptability of "the Lives"

Evidence collected by Dr. Louis Weinstein, of Boston University Medical School, however, suggests that such prophylactic procedure has produced a newer, stronger bacillus that is immune to the antibiotics. Dr. Weinstein studied the records of 428 patients admitted to a Boston hospital for measles:

> Of these, 130 had been given antibiotics to prevent secondary bacterial infections, but 36 developed the infections anyway. Out of the remaining 298 patients—those who had not been given antibiotics to prevent bacterial infections—only 42 developed the infections.

> What has been happening over the years is that bacteria, which can and do "resist" the antibiotics, have been replacing the bacteria which couldn't and so died.

These results recall what H.P.B. has said about the amazing adaptability of "the lives," and suggest a further deduction: "Physical karma" can be ameliorated only up to a certain point; beyond that, the individual's specific karma may not be tampered with.

The UP report concludes:

> The New England Journal of Medicine, which published Dr. Weinstein's evidence, commented gravely that his findings reemphasize the need for critical review of the routine prophylactic (preventive) use of antibiotics in simple non-bacterial infections—notably, the common cold—and influenza, and indeed in many other situations in which such prophylaxis is frequently advocated.

When Friend Turns Enemy

Another instance in which a life-saving "specific" becomes a deadly enemy when used as a "preventive" comes to attention. Steven M. Spencer's article, "Mystery of the Blinded Babies" (*Saturday Evening Post,* June 11, 1955), tells of the 12-year search for explanation of the alarming increase of blindness among premature babies, beginning in 1941. The article is replete with interesting details, but pertinent to our present emphasis is the following:

> It took twelve years to track down and convict the guilty factor—twelve years of persistent, ingenious, but sometimes discouraging and contradictory medical sleuthing. . . . More than sixty possibilities were considered at various times, and upward of a dozen were investigated, argued about and abandoned before the weight of evidence finally settled upon the culprit that now stands convicted.
>
> And this was such an unlikely suspect, with so excellent a past record, that most medical people at first refused to believe it could be guilty. After all, who would have dreamed that oxygen, the breath of life, the very thing everybody credited with helping these premature babies to survive, could also be a factor in blinding them? It was incredible, fantastic!

Emergency Use Only

> The answer appears to be yes. While oxygen will continue to be given as a life-saver in emergencies, as when the baby turns blue, its free and unrestricted use for premature infants has been condemned by a top-level jury of seventy-five pediatricians and eye specialists. Their verdict was handed down after a carefully controlled study

of several hundred preemies in eighteen hospitals in the eastern half of the United States. The doctors' finding that even a few days exposure to high oxygen concentrations may be hazardous to the developing young eyes, is currently revolutionizing nursery practices all over the country. . . .

Authorities are emphatic in urging that those in charge of the nurseries make certain they know exactly how much oxygen they are giving when they do have to give it. Estimating the concentration on the basis of the flow per minute from the oxygen tank has been found to be grossly unreliable. Recommended instead are oxygen meters which give an accurate and instantaneous reading of the actual concentration in the incubator. Also available are devices that mix oxygen and air to a specified formula, or tank oxygen already mixed with nitrogen in a 40-60 proportion.

Nature's Finer Forces

Theosophists, convinced that *every* potency has both life-giving and death-dealing aspects, will not be surprised at these medical findings. It is, however, particularly interesting to note that this blindness in premature babies—first diagnosed as cataract, then as retrolental fibroplasia, a fibrous growth back of the lens—was not due to diseased or useless embryonic tissue, but "consisted partly of a detached and crumpled retina, the very heart of the seeing apparatus." Doubtless only a skilled "Eastern Occultist" could explain just why pure, concentrated oxygen should have such an effect on the undeveloped eye of a premature infant; this is certainly suggested by H.P.B. (*S.D.* II, 592.):

> Belief in "Creators," or the personified Powers of Nature, is in truth no polytheism, but a philosophical necessity. Like all the other planets of our system, the Earth has seven Logoi—the emanating rays of the one "Father-Ray"—the *protogonos,* or the manifested "Logos" —he who sacrifices his Esse (or flesh, the Universe) that the world may live and every creature therein have conscious being.
>
> Numbers 3 and 4 are respectively male and female, Spirit and Matter, and their union is the emblem of life eternal in spirit on its ascending arc, and in matter as the ever resurrecting element—by procreation and reproduction. . . . This is why all the matter of the Universe, when analyzed by science to its ultimates, can be reduced to four elements only—carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, and hydrogen; and why the three primaries, the noumenoi of the four, or graduated Spirit or Force, have remained a *terra incognita* and mere speculations, names, to exact Science. Her servants must believe in and study first the primary causes, before they can hope to fathom the nature and acquaint themselves with the potentialities of the effects.

SIBELIUS ON ART, LIFE AND REINCARNATION

The national heroes of most countries are political or military figures. It is, therefore, says music critic Howard Taubman in the New York *Times* (Dec. 4, 1955), "a tribute to Sibelius and to Finland that a man of music should be a nation's most distinguished citizen." Sibelius' music has been with us so long, and he has kept himself so aloof, that we tend to think of him as a figure in the Finnish epics he celebrated in his tone poems. But Sibelius is not only a man of music or a legend, he is the head of a large family as well. He himself has remarked that "a person who has never had to bind his fate to the fate of others misses a lot of the finer things of life." Taubman writes:

> The interrelationship between life and art is one of Sibelius' chief concerns. . . . Sibelius' identification with the fields, the woods, the sea and the sky is so profound that it has always permeated his music. His feeling for nature is not that of the observer and sentimentalist. It is as though he were one with it in all its wildest and most vivid or most somber manifestations. . . . As a boy, Sibelius wandered in the wilderness of his native province of Häme. Birds always fascinated him. "Millions of years ago, in my previous incarnations," he once told Jalas [his son-in-law], "I must have been related to swans or wild geese, because I can still feel that affinity." Jalas observed that his instrumentation, particularly of the woodwinds in many of his works, reminded one of the sound of birds. Sibelius was visibly pleased. "Of course they do," he replied. "The sounds of birds have always attracted me. After all, art is the intuitive understanding of the voices of nature.

A POET AND A PHILOSOPHY

Very different in quality from the present inflamed interest in reincarnation is that intuitive perception of unendingness which has fired the imagination of the poets. In the case of Yeats, the reviewer of the *Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* (reviewed *Newsweek,* April 9) suggests, the perception of reincarnation did not come in intuitive flashes, but was rather the result of study and reflection:

> Toward the end of his life, Yeats began to find personal strength and a fiery poetic imagery in the realm of the transcendental, the religions. . . . His interest in religion was especially confusing to many readers because of the unorthodox, occult terms in which he expressed it. As a youth, he was fascinated by the Russian theosophist Madame Blavatsky, and he went on to explore other avenues of Eastern mysticism.